1

MR. BEHE: Your Honor, with the Court's permission I would call the following matter; that is, the United States of America v. Deborah Fetterolf. This is docketed to Criminal No. 00-052. May the record reflect that Miss Fetterolf is present before you with her counsel Mr. Lappas, and now is the time and place set for sentencing in this matter.

The United States has filed a motion for guideline departure pursuant to Section 5K1.1 of the guidelines. I would like to point out to Your Honor that there is a mistake in that motion on page 2, paragraph 3, the seventh line down where it says to trial the week of August 8, 2000. I mistakenly put the name Steckbeck down, it should be Miss Fetterolf's name, she's the one who provided substantial information. That may have affected Your Honor's reading of it because it was not Janice Steckbeck, it was the defendant here. It was an oversight on my part that I didn't catch that, but she did provide substantial information.

THE COURT: I understand from the motion that the defendant is also providing information to local law enforcement authorities.

MR. BEHE: Yes.

THE COURT: Is that in Dauphin County?

MR. BEHE: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Lappas, do you have a copy

of Mr. Behe's motion and also the report of the probation office calculating a total offense level 15 and criminal history category I?

MR. LAPPAS: That is correct, Your Honor. We have received the presentence report, reviewed it with -- I have reviewed it with my client, and the Court would have through the probation office our November 3, 2000 letter of objections which were eventually decided by the probation officer.

The only substantial objection, Your Honor, deals with the enhancement for role in the offense, and I think and hope that the government's 5K1 motion and remarks that I plan to make today may obviate the need to rule on that objection, so if I might move right to the issue of departure.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. LAPPAS: I received this motion yesterday, Your Honor, as the day it was filed, Mr. Behe promptly faxed me a copy of it, and in reading it over I must say that in all the times that I have represented cooperating defendants in federal cases or in fact in state cases, this was — this motion reveals a level of cooperation and help which is almost unprecedented in my experience. Quoting from paragraph 5 on page 3 of the motion Mr. Behe states correctly I believe that the defendant has complied with every request made by the United States, promptly forfeited \$10,000 to the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

United States as required by the plea agreement and is willing to assist the law enforcement agencies in the investigation of other massage parlors.

It also true, as Your Honor will no doubt recall from her own recollection of the events in question, that Miss Steckbeck and Mr. Hamer were prepared and my impression was adamantly desirous of proceeding to trial. On the day we picked the jury in fact their counsel were I think intending to and certainly could have mounted a vigorous and perhaps effective defense. What changed that all was the knowledge that was revealed to counsel for the other defendants in Your Honor's chambers, if I remember correctly, that Miss Fetterolf was now cooperating. Although we did pick a jury because of scheduling constraints, as soon as the other defendants realized that Deborah Fetterolf was cooperating, they pleaded guilty or indicated their desire to plead guilty, I think even that very week. So her cooperation has not only been extensive, and in fact, as Mr. Behe said, she's complied with every condition, every desire he imposed upon her, but it's been effective.

This is not a case to which she cooperated to no effect, her cooperation has already borne fruit, and I believe the government would agree that it is likely to bear further fruit in the future.

Now that puts us I think in a situation where not

11.

only is she entitled to the departure which we have seen recommended by Mr. Behe's motion, but also I think this raises a Leiberman case in which Miss Fetterolf by her actions has demonstrated an exceptionally high level of acceptance of responsibility. She forfeited \$10,000 almost immediately upon executing the plea agreement. We were served through my office a matter of weeks ago with the forfeiture complaint, which we did not answer, of course, in light of her plea agreement. She has spent I believe many hours with various investigators and again provided information which can only be described as extensive.

Months and a day. My request is this, that Your Honor sentence Deborah Fetterolf in the 6 to 12 month range, which is only a slight reduction from what the government has requested, and I suggest that that reduction is proper under the Leiberman standard. A sentence of between 6 and 12 months could, with Your Honor's order, which I request, place her in Zone B of the guideline sentencing table. Under 5C1.1(c)(3) she could then receive a sentence of probation that includes as a condition that period of intermittent confinement or essentially work release or home detention be substituted for imprisonment.

I think that if Your Honor read, as I'm sure you did, Miss Fetterolf's letter to the probation officer and to

you, it reveals an unusually eloquent statement of contrition and a sincere one. She and I worked on that letter for hours, and I can tell you that every statement in there was her heartfelt expression of contrition.

She has literally turned her life around by virtue of this prosecution, which it's too bad that it had to happen this way, but unfortunately it did happen.

She has since her plea she tells me started her own janitorial service business. So she does have gainful employment that she could perform in the event that the Court sentences along the lines that I have requested.

There is little more that I can say for her beyond what she's said for herself. I think her actions in this matter since pleading guilty speak volumes for the fact that she is a suitable candidate for rehabilitation, and I ask the Court to sentence her under a guideline of 5C1.1(c)(3) to a sentence of work release or home detention. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Lappas, just so I'm clear, you indicated that when you started out that maintaining your objections would be somewhat dependent on whether or not the Court would find substantial assistance. Are you preserving the objections that were stated in the original probation report or are you waiving them now?

MR. LAPPAS: No, we're not waiving them, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Miss Fetterolf, do you have anything you want to say?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, Your Honor. I am truly sorry for how things have worked with the business and everything. The way I see this business today is not the same as I saw it back then. I truly in my heart wanted to help those women and get them out of that type of business, and I was wrong. It was not the right thinking. I have changed my life around, and the only thing that I can say about today is that I have put it in God's hands, and that's where I'm meant to be. Thank you.

Mr. Behe.

2.1

MR. BEHE: Yes, Your Honor, since Mr. Lappas is maintaining his objections, I would just simply state that I believe that the response prepared by the probation officer in this matter Mrs. Regan addresses those objections, and I would ask the Court to adopt the presentence report and the addendum which addresses the objections. Clearly under the facts of this particular case the defendant deserves the 3 level enhancement for the role in the offense, and I believe that the objections were addressed by Mrs. Regan.

My motion for guideline departure that was filed yesterday is one that I respectfully ask the Court to accept in this matter. I do believe that the straw that broke the camel's back in the Stockbeck and Hamer case was the

knowledge that Miss Fetterolf, who although was not charged as a co-conspirator with the two of them, knew them, worked with them, knew of their business, had contacts with them during the investigation, was prepared to testify. The parties would communicate about who might be undercover police officers, all the things that would have just completely stripped the defense of Steckbeck and Hamer, that they did not know what was going on, it was completely away from them, and once the defendants learned of her willingness to testify against them, I think that was what turned the tide, although they pled guilty reluctantly.

Secondly, they, unlike Miss Fetterolf, have not agreed to cooperate and have not cooperated, although they certainly have the opportunity to do so and can still do so.

And one thing that Mr. Lappas did not mention but it's clear in the presentence report, I do not believe Miss Fetterolf has a criminal record of any sort, and I think that although this particular crime went on for a few years and involved a substantial amount of money, it is a heck of a way to have your first crime. She does not have any criminal history, and I think that speaks to her as well.

If Your Honor is going to depart from the guideline range to whatever sentence Your Honor decides to impose if Your Honor doesn't accept their recommendation, unlike Mr. Lappas, I would respectfully request that the sentencing be

in Zone C, and that would allow for half in and half out, if I'm not mistaken, in terms of confinement, and those are all the remarks I have.

THE COURT: Miss Fetterolf, like the other defendants who appeared before the Court, you present a situation where the Court has difficulty overlooking the fact that you engaged in a criminal episode, a criminal enterprise, that was ongoing, that is very serious, to know that a person every day for eight years of her life went to work every single day knowing that she was violating the law, and that weighs very heavily against the things that your lawyer has said and Mr. Behe has said. However, I am convinced by the letter that you wrote and by the things that Mr. Behe and Mr. Lappas have said that you are truly repentant and that you're not going to be a person who is ever going to appear before this Court again.

I also think in evaluating the government's motion for downward depart that the information that you gave was helpful, it was timely, it was substantial.

We are here in federal court I think for a reason, local authorities have tried for a long time to get at the criminal conduct that is the subject of these three prosecutions and have had no apparent success doing that, so I think that the information that you've provided to the federal authorities and to local authorities is very

important, it's very helpful.

I think judging from the conduct and the demeanor of Mr. Hamer, you may have provided that information at some risk to yourself, so I do think weighing against the offense here is a real assistance to the government, and you deserve to be credited for that. For that reason I'm going to depart 3 levels to place you in a sentencing range of 10 to 16 months. I will recognize the government's recommendation and sentence you to 12 months and 1 day.

Pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984 it's the judgment of the Court on Count 1 that the defendant Deborah Fetterolf is hereby committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a term of 12 months and 1 day.

The Court finds that the defendant has the ability to pay a fine, accordingly it's further ordered that the defendant pay to the United States the sum of \$4,100, consisting of a fine of \$4,000 and a special assessment of \$100. The fine and assessment are due immediately, shall be paid through the Clerk of Court and are payable during the period of incarceration with any balance to be paid within 2 years of the defendant's release from custody.

The Court finds that the defendant does not have the ability to pay interest and waives the interest requirement.

Upon release from imprisonment the defendant shall be placed on supervised release for a term of 2 years.

Within 72 hours of release from the custody of the Bureau of Prisons the defendant shall report in person to the probation office in the district to which she's released.

while on supervised release the defendant shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by the Court and with the following additional conditions: The defendant shall participate in mental health treatment, to include treatment for gambling, as directed by the probation office. The defendant shall pay any balance of the fine imposed by this judgment which remains unpaid at the commencement of the term of supervised release in minimum monthly installments of no less than \$100. As a condition of supervision the defendant shall submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from custody and at least two periodic drug tests thereafter.

Miss Fetterolf, you can appeal your conviction if you believe that your guilty plea was somehow unlawful or involuntary or that there is some other fundamental defect in the proceeding that was not waived by your guilty plea.

You also have a statutory right to appeal your sentence under certain circumstances, particularly if you think that sentence is contrary to law. With few exceptions any notice of appeal must be filed within 10 days that the

sentence is imposed on you.

If you are unable to pay the costs of an appeal, you can apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis. If you so request, the Clerk of Court will prepare and file a notice of appeal on your behalf.

The basis for the sentence is as follows: The Court adopts the factual finding and guideline application in the presentence report. The sentence departs from the guideline range upon motion of the government as a result of the defendant's substantial assistance.

Mr. Behe, do you have any objection to a voluntary surrender in this case?

MR. BEHE: Not at all, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Is there a date that you have in mind?

MR. BEHE: I do not have any. I don't know whether Mr. Lappas has spoken to his client about how long it would take for her to get her affairs in order.

THE COURT: Mr. Lappas.

MR. LAPPAS: Thirty days, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Miss Kennedy.

THE CLERK: February 7.

THE COURT: Mr. Behe, is there anything else for the record in this matter?

MR. BEHE: Yes, Your Honor, I move to dismiss all remaining counts of the indictment. I believe the defendant